

#8

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/913,560	LUCAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Naschica S Morrison	3632	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Naschica S Morrison. (3) ____.
- (2) Eli Zborovsky. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 24 July 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Schmitt '780 and Kihara '040.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the amendment to claim 9 with reference to the direction of rotation of the rotary spindle being perpendicular to the emission direction and pointed out that this orientation is critical. Applicant further stated that none of the prior art references of record appear to disclose this feature.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required